

SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

# NATIONAL 20 Cents September 29, 1956 REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

## *How Conservatives Should Vote*

READERS' SYMPOSIUM

## *Reflections on a Right-Wing Protest*

REVILO OLIVER

## *British Labor Swings Left*

F. A. VOIGT

---

*Articles and Reviews by* . . . . . RICHARD M. WEAVER  
C. DICKERMAN WILLIAMS • FRED A. UTLEY • L. BRENT BOZELL  
WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR. • SAM M. JONES • WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

# — For the Record —

Republican Finance Committees report a sudden spurt in contributions. Reason: As many contributors write, they wanted to make sure, before contributing to the GOP campaign this year, that the dump-Nixon movement had failed.

AFL-CIO President George Meany accused Senator Kefauver of political naiveté. Kefauver's suggestion for improving Soviet-U.S.A. relations through more visits back and forth is unrealistic, said Meany, since there are no free people in the Communist-dominated countries.... Republican Senator Goldwater of Arizona placed this problem in mathematics (and logic) before Stevenson: How can the Democrats promise an additional \$10 billion in Federal expenditures (the estimate is Goldwater's) if they are reelected, and still cut taxes, as they also promise?

The Texas Democratic Party came out of its convention more bitterly divided than ever. The conservative wing of the party claims its standard-bearer, Senator Price Daniel, sold out to the Johnson-Rayburn segment.... Virginia is one of the first states to announce that the States Rights ticket (T. Coleman Andrews for President) will appear on its ballots in November.... Republican Representative Ralph Gwinn of New York urges conservatives to fight their battles from within the Republican Party, instead of branching off into third-party movements.

Farm income is now running at the best level in two and a half years, according to the Agricultural Department, which estimates it at an annual rate of \$12 billion or more.... Steel production this year will be the second highest in history, despite the five-week strike. Expected output: 113 to 115 million tons, only two to four million tons below last year's all-time high.

Chester Bowles, who is often mentioned as most likely to succeed Dulles should Stevenson be elected, tells his associates, in confidence, that he believes we should recognize Red China.

The Daily Worker is asking its subscribers to circumvent the Internal Revenue Bureau by mailing renewal money directly to the printing company.... One supposedly crack airborne division lost more than 9,000 men last year, a turnover of 87 per cent.

Interruption of traffic in the Suez Canal would affect Britain first and hardest. Britain moved 32.7 million tons of cargo through the Canal last year, three times more than France.... Insurance rate for cargoes touching Egyptian ports is three and one-half times as high as it was before the crisis (rates for cargoes going through the Canal are more than seven times as high).

Recent Polish feelers for a large-scale loan from the United States were discontinued by Warsaw after U.S. officials indicated the loan was out of the question.

The Bonn Government will bow to the opposition to the extent of limiting draftee service to twelve months (instead of the expected eighteen.... Food prices in France, stabilized earlier this year, started to climb steeply last month. During the final fifteen days of August, cheese prices rose 10 to 15 per cent, butter prices 12 to 20 per cent.

More Americans (78 per cent) read newspapers than watch TV (58 per cent), according to a recent survey. But TV viewers put in an average of eighteen hours and twenty-four minutes a week before their screens while newspaper readers devote only three hours and fifty-eight minutes a week to their papers.

Prince Rainier has hired a public relations expert to popularize Monaco, at the expense of Monte Carlo's public relations. International gossip has it that relations between Rainier and Greek Shipping magnate Onassis (who owns the Monte Carlo Casino) are more strained than ever.... the BBC has lowered the boom on a recent rock'n roll number "Rockin' Through the Rye." The rock'n roll version of "Comin' Through the Rye," said BBC in announcing the ban, tampers with British and Scottish song traditions.

# NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR and PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

## EDITORS

James Burnham Willmoore Kendall  
Suzanne La Follette  
Jonathan Mitchell William S. Schlammm

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

## ASSOCIATES AND CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, L. Brent Bozell, Priscilla L. Buckley, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, Frank S. Meyer, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Morrie Ryskind, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

## FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

Geneva: Wilhelm Roepke  
London: F. A. Voigt Madrid: J. Dervin  
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

BUSINESS MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

**Contents** SEPTEMBER 29, 1956 VOL. II. NO. 19

**THE WEEK** 3

## ARTICLES

Reflections on a Right-Wing Protest  
Revilo Oliver 9  
How Conservatives Should Vote  
Readers' Symposium 13

## DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 2  
National Trends L. Brent Bozell 8  
The Campaign Sam M. Jones 11  
Letter from London F. A. Voigt 12  
Letter from Taipei Freda Utley 15  
The Law of the Land C. Dickerman Williams 16  
Arts and Manners William S. Schlammm 17  
To the Editor 21  
The Ivory Tower Wm. F. Buckley, Jr. 22

## BOOKS IN REVIEW

Social Science in Excelsis Richard M. Weaver 18  
Liberty's Hall of Fame Frank S. Meyer 19  
Also Its Excuses Robert Phelps 19  
Reviewed in Brief Revilo Oliver 20

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly for fifty weeks a year at Orange, Conn. by National Weekly, Inc. Copyrighted 1956 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc. Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

## EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:

211 East 37 St.

New York 16, N. Y.

Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES: Twenty cents a copy, \$7.00 a year, \$13.00 for two years. Foreign, \$9.00 a year; Canada, \$8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

# The WEEK

● Last week was the week when the Reverend Elder Lightfoot Solomon Michaux informed the President of how the saints analyze the difference between his and the previous two Administrations. In the beginning was the New Deal. Then the Fair Deal. And now, said the Reverend Elder, "the Heaven-born Deal." The President was much struck by this intelligence and repeated it to Mr. Nixon and Republican lieutenants at the airport breakfast send-off for the Vice-President, whom he instructed to go out and speak the truth to all the people. "Give 'em Heaven," he said, beaming. And Mr. Nixon beamed, and Hall beamed, and all the angels sang their praises.

● The latest political document of the Labor Party in England zeroes in on the residual inequalities that have obstinately survived the socialist steamroller and the conservative scalpel. There are, even, vestiges of social classes left to contend with! The evil in such a thing the authors do not feel the need to discuss. "We take it as self-evident," they write, "that our society will be healthier and happier without social classes than it is with them." They deplore the advantage that accrues to children "whose family background was materially and culturally enriched." They call for abolition of the inequality and nepotism that prevail in "small and family businesses"; they rage over the fact that, by one means or another, there are those who continue to "enjoy standards of living far higher than their incomes should permit after payment of tax." They promise, in short, continued warfare against anyone who presumes to labor with extraordinary zeal or ingenuity in behalf of himself and his family. Let him labor, they say in effect, but let the State see to it that he labors in vain.

● Even the *New York Times* seems a little nostalgic for the days when the Supreme Court, not yet having converted itself into a perpetual constitutional convention, could be regarded as a-political. Justice Minton's seat, it declares in a headline that no deskman seems to have regarded as too odd to run, "May Go To a Judge."

● On September 20 there began at United Nations Headquarters one more mass conference (eighty-seven nations attending) through which the United



States will dissipate another installment of its substance and power. After a couple of months of dreary talk, the world will be asked to hail the birth of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Mr. Burnham disclosed in *NATIONAL REVIEW*, August 11, that in the preparatory commission our representatives have already, under Communist and neutralist pressure, accepted Vienna—at the edge of the Iron Curtain—as the Agency's location, and have agreed to a composition of the governing committee that puts us in a minority from the beginning. In practice, the function of the Agency will be merely to siphon our nuclear knowledge, equipment, discoveries and materials to our enemies and potential enemies.

● This is the third school year since the Supreme Court's decision on segregation. In spite of all the machine guns and tanks and saturation news coverage, fewer Southern school children are being "integrated" this year than last; and there were fewer last year than at the start in 1954, when Washington and Baltimore led off a parade that is proving to have thin, and thinning, ranks. Louisville was the only town of any size to join this year, and there the integration does not cover the entire school system. In fact, in several prior years more schools were voluntarily integrated than in 1956 under the guns of the Court.

● The Administration is making its customary vigorous response to Brazilian President Kubitschek's recent pro-Communist, anti-American moves (see *NATIONAL REVIEW*, Sept. 15). The ink was hardly dry on the news that Brazil was cancelling its agreement with us on the exchange of nuclear materials before the Export-Import Bank announced a new credit grant to Brazil of \$100 million. The money will be poured into projects so plainly unsound as to have prompted the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to refuse all further loans to Brazil at this time.

● A thoughtful reader sends us an item we missed. Lord Beaverbrook, when last in New York, was interviewed by Bob Considine, who asked his opinion of the United Nations. "You Americans are a strange contradiction," said Beaverbrook. "You spend huge sums of money fighting the fifth column in your country, but at the same time, down on the East Side of New York, you've erected the biggest fifth column headquarters in the world—the United Nations. It is filled with men who wish to subvert the government of the United States. Yet you pay out your own good money (and Great Britain does too) to bring these people into your midst . . . Every night before I turn in I look out the window at the UN building, lighted from top to bottom at all hours of the night, agleam

with radiance, and as I go to sleep I say to myself, 'my God, what a waste of electricity.' I wish we had all that power in New Brunswick, Canada, where there is need for a new paper mill." Wish we had said that. (Or have we?)

● If the earth still turns around the sun, and if anything should happen to *NATIONAL REVIEW*, and if we find ourselves emigrating to the West, and if we decide to settle down in Utah, and if we get there by 1958, and if we get around to registering as voters, we will vote for J. Bracken Lee for Senator.

● *NATIONAL REVIEW* mourns the death of Mr. Samuel J. Kornhauser, a prominent lawyer from Cleveland who devoted much of his life to the cause of limited and constitutional government. He was a scholar and, we know from mutual friends, a kind and generous man. We are proud that he read, and wrote for, this journal.

## *The Cost of Dishonor*

A man of honor does not stop to figure just what he is going to get by being honorable. He acts honorably because he is honorable. But, like most other virtues, honor often does in the end bring extrinsic rewards also; and dishonor is often punished by the world as harshly as by conscience.

No one who reads Mr. Bozell's summary of our national conduct in the Suez crisis will doubt that we as a nation have been dishonorable: toward our first and closest allies, Britain and France. We are bound to them by the culture and civilization we share, by a thousand entanglements of interest and custom and treaty and taste and, most indissolubly of all, we are bound by the common enemy who threatens us.

Our dishonor does not consist in disagreeing with our allies about what course of action to pursue at Suez. We have done much worse than disagree. We have betrayed our allies. We have coldly disregarded the needs upon which their survival literally depends: we have published to the world our statement that we will not stand by them if a full showdown comes; our President, by unavoidable implication, has labeled it "aggression" if they decide that their self-defense is impossible without armed action; we have failed to make plain that we are in their camp, not in their enemies'.

In January, let us imagine, Peiping applies for entry to the United Nations and demands the "peaceful liberation" of Taiwan as the earnest of "reduced tensions." What then shall we expect Britain and France to say?

And in February, if Moscow, calling for the abolition of all trade boycotts for the sake of peace and





"Hey-ookh-nyem!"  
(Song of the Suez Boatmen)

mutual prosperity, offers big contracts to Paris and London? What reply will they make?

And in March, if a twenty-nation Communist-neutralist bloc proposes the revision of the Panama Canal statutes? What objection, please, when Britain and France express their approval?

## But It Is an Issue

Adlai Stevenson is banking very hard on the short memory of the people.

Four years ago he would have been compelled to tear Truman apart had Truman proclaimed his belief in the innocence of Alger Hiss. For in 1952 the American people were aroused on the subject of internal security. We had tasted some of the bitter fruits of a lax policy toward loyalty risks. We were fighting a war in Korea against an enemy that manifestly possessed some of our deepest secrets. The enemy had got hold of the atom bomb five years ahead of schedule, from under the noses of a government enormously indifferent to the comings and goings of loyalty risks up and down bureaucratic corridors.

Mr. Stevenson's disavowal of Mr. Truman was most mincingly put. He said he had "no reason to doubt the verdict of the jury," whereupon he scolded those who felt it relevant to ask the question. "There is no issue in this campaign," he said, "of communism in government and I believe President Eisenhower has repeatedly said so. I had hoped, therefore, we could talk about the real problems that confront the U.S. and our own party differences, and not be diverted."

Yet just two nights earlier, before an audience of 8,000 people, he evidently thought differently about the matter, for he accused the Eisenhower Administration of committing the most heinous crimes against the integrity of the civil service, of "shameless political trickery," of battering "our public servants into a collection of weak and spineless conformists"—all under the pretext of getting Communists out of government.

There is an issue bearing on Communists in government, and it is not wished away simply because all sides agree that they are against Communists in government. Everyone is against Communists in government. The question is how to keep them out. Painful and costly experience has taught us that the only way in which an effective security system can be maintained is by resolving all reasonable doubts as to an employee's loyalty or reliability in favor of the government.

The Democratic Party is not the party of treason, but—cry smear! if you will—it is the party of Harry Truman, in whose reign scores of Communists prowled about Washington, lords of all they surveyed, who still refuses to concede the guilt of Harry Dexter White or Alger Hiss. It is the party of Adlai Stevenson, who disparages every effort the Republicans have made over the past four years to keep security risks out of office, and who publicly endorsed, three years ago, a book by Henry Steele Commager (*Freedom, Loyalty, and Dissent*) challenging the very need for a loyalty system.

The question of Communism in government is, then, distinctly an issue. Mr. Eisenhower has evidently resolved not to sink his teeth into anything tougher than pabulum during the campaign, so we look to Mr. Nixon to take the issue up, and bear down hard.

What a sad beginning he made in Indianapolis when he accepted as satisfactory Stevenson's statement on Hiss!

## Misfortune

There was a young man named Javits,  
Who had the most sociable habits.

But unlike you or me,  
On duty or spree,  
He encountered more Commies than Babbitts.

ELMER DAVIS and ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

ISSUE

## A CLEAN POLITICS APPEAL

on behalf of:

FRANK CHURCH

RICHARD STENGEL

vs.

vs.

Herman Welker

Everett M. Dirksen

*This advertisement was originally run as an experiment—a volunteer citizens' effort to test whether the informed public would actually do something about a situation it has often deplored, whether it would make a genuine effort to balance the flow of special interest money in politics. Thousands of your fellow Americans, responding from every state of the union, have made it a success. We know that you, too, will want to help.*

If you are after a special subsidy, tariff or paving contract, don't read any further. We're not your kind of people.

If you are one of the small group of "fat cats" whose contributions will account for 95% of the \$200,000,000 that will be spent on politics this year, stop right here. You don't need us to remind you of the importance of this election, or to suggest what you can do about it.

The fact is that candidates without access to wealthy supporters or special interest groups are gravely handicapped. Unfortunately, it is often the liberal and more independent candidates who have the least money, particularly in Congressional campaigning. That so many good men win anyhow is an indication of the importance of giving them at least the minimum necessary to make themselves known to the voters who must make the decision.

The outcome of the two contests for which we seek your support will do more to set the tone of national politics in the next two years than any others.

In Idaho, 32 year old Frank Church (D) defeated Glen Taylor for the Democratic nomination and offers Idahoans their first opportunity in a decade to elect a well-balanced and responsible Senator. His opponent in the general election, erratic incumbent Senator Herman Welker, is noted for his hot pursuit of causes having little relation to Idaho or national interests.

In Illinois, Richard Stengel (D), frequently named by non-partisan groups as an outstanding member of the Illinois Legislature, has an excellent chance of upsetting incumbent Senator Everett M. Dirksen

(R) if he can come even close to matching Dirksen's campaign funds. Dirksen, whom Time magazine called "the Wizard of Ooze," is one of the most dispensable members of the Senate, and the prospect of his replacement by a young, vigorous and responsible challenger of Stengel's caliber is already attracting impressive Republican and Independent support in Illinois.

THE continued success of this experiment—and very possibly the outcome of these elections—is up to you. Don't depend on other readers. Make your contribution (\$100 — \$5 — \$3) as large as possible and send it, with the attached coupon, today!

*Elmer Davis*  
ELMER DAVIS

*Archibald MacLeish*  
ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

### Concerning contributions:

Checks or money orders should be made out to "A Clean Politics Appeal." Contributions may be earmarked; otherwise they will be divided equally between the two candidates. All funds collected from this appeal will go to the candidates. Administration costs are being paid by the National Committee for an Effective Congress.

A Clean Politics Appeal  
Box 1163, Washington 13, D. C.

Messrs. Davis & MacLeish:

Enclosed is my contribution of \$..... to A Clean Politics Appeal.

☐ Please divide it equally between the campaigns of Frank Church and Richard Stengel.

☐ Please earmark it as follows:

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State .....

PLEASE PRINT

T

## The Polluters

A full-page advertisement—reproduced in full, and free of charge, on this page—has been appearing in recent weeks in various Liberal journals.

If this appeal had been issued by, say, Mayors Kelly and Nash, one might pass over it lightly. Just another, characteristically cynical, assumption of the vestments of righteousness by a couple of shady politicians who have never agonized over moral niceties. But here, *in flagrante*, are two professional moralizers, engaged in moralizing even while they commit offenses against decent controversy! They, and their retinues, are perhaps so blinded by the splendor of the cause they serve as to lose sight of what it is they have done. Let us, then, take them by the hand, and lead them through their appeal for political morality:

1. In labeling the advertisement "A Clean Politics Appeal" the authors imply that those candidates against whom Stengel and Church are running are guilty of unclean political behavior. There is no other construction. (And, incidentally, bear in mind, here and below, that Mr. Davis and Mr. MacLeish are professional verbalizers. Mr. Davis can mobilize words to say anything he means. Mr. MacLeish has even greater powers, for he can have them say anything he means and make it rhyme. So they are not to be excused on the grounds of awkwardness in the handling of words.)

a. Is Mr. Dirksen unclean? Does he fight dirty? We are not aware that he does, or even that Mr. Stengel has charged him with doing so. It is not relevant that Time magazine calls him oleaginous. The question is, is he unclean? If so, where is the demonstration?

b. What about Senator Welker? Who says he fights dirty? Is it unclean to pursue causes which in the opinion of Messrs. Davis and MacLeish have "little relation to Idaho or the national interests?" Certainly the appeal does not establish that he fights dirty—except by insinuation. I.e., by smear.

"2. Mr. Davis and Mr. MacLeish imply that only those who are "after a special subsidy, tariff, or paving contract" would back the two Republicans against the Democrats. No one, it is the gist of the Appeal, could vote for Dirksen and Welker out of a conviction that they would better serve the nation. Such a thought is presumably unclean.

3. A "small group of 'fat cats' . . . account for 95% of the \$200,000,000 that will be spent on politics this year." Where were those figures assembled? Is a labor union a fat cat? Is a labor union a special interest?

It is as simple and uncomplicated as this. Messrs. Davis and MacLeish favor certain programs of social



action which Messrs. Stengel and Church also favor. Therefore, Davis and MacLeish support them. But rather than solicit help for them by the humdrum expedient of calling attention to their political Liberalism, they tone up the contest as involving a fight between Corruption and Integrity, between the general welfare and private greed. That tactic is contemptible.

We are forwarding copies of the Appeal to the Committee for Cultural Freedom, which several years ago issued a statement on the ethics of controversy. We shall ask the Committee to measure this appeal against their standards, and let us have their judgment as to whether Messrs. Davis and MacLeish are observing the canons of fair debate. If not, we shall propose that the Committee formally censure them.

## As Maine Goes

### *So Goes the New Republicanism*

The results of the Maine election have been "explained" about one hundred different ways, and we do not propose to pass as experts by presuming a hundred-and-first explanation. But one observation we have not seen made, which, it occurs to us, is at least worth pondering.

That observation is that the only two times in modern history that Maine has gone Democratic have been when Dwight Eisenhower was President.

Now we know all the rules of logic, and don't propose to play *post hoc ergo propter hoc* with these data. We do not, in a word, propose to blame Mr. Eisenhower for the loss of Maine to the Democratic Party—even though the Republicans based their campaign almost exclusively on the radiance of Ike. But we do, with trepidation, suggest that the following conclusion is inescapable: The extravagant claims of the Eisenhower cult were dashed to the ground in Maine, and no one seems to be aware of it.

The Republican Party of Eisenhower has been advanced, these four years, as a brand new political synthesis: as the ultimate, overpowering, providential non-revolutionary answer to progressive socialism. The New Republicanism was to render obsolete the pretensions of socialism; it was to capture the imagination of all the people; it was to blend together, with a wizard's skill, freedom and security; it was to hold forth a vision of wealth and greatness that would sweep the people off their feet, converting them in overwhelming numbers to the great cause of Progressive Moderation.

All, that is, except the people of Maine . . . And 1936 notwithstanding, as Maine goes, so go millions of other Americans—more than enough to force the conclusion that the behemoth constructed around

Eisenhowerism turns out to be nothing more than a vast dirigible, full of hot air, eminently collapsible, incapable of sustaining even the exiguous state of Maine.

If Eisenhowerism cannot boast of political invulnerability, what else has it got to boast of?

## Remember Waterbury

Three months ago, the elders of the City of Waterbury, Connecticut, voted to go along with the United Auto Workers' boycott of the Kohler Manufacturing Company (see "If That's How They Want It," Sept. 8), and instructed city contractors not to buy any Kohler products.

Last week, a chastened Board of Aldermen reversed the boycott decision—because, said the Board, Waterbury's City Counsel had ruled it illegal. Waterbury's contractors, he said, must do business with the lowest bidder, even if his name is Kohler.

The City Counsel's pronouncement was face-saving, pure and simple.

The reason for the Board's retreat was that the boycott turned out to be bad business and bad politics. It ended up hurting Waterbury far more than it hurt Kohler; and it marked the first effective setback to Mr. Walter Reuther's plan to break Kohler for having the impudence to disagree with him.

First the Waterbury Chamber of Commerce had complained. Then both local newspapers. Then local business and professional groups. Hundreds of letters from scattered individuals protested the Board's rank partisanship. A company in Louisville informed Waterbury that henceforward it would buy no more products manufactured in that city—not until the Kohler boycott was lifted. Other companies, and many individuals, threatened similar reprisals. Boycott Kohler, they said, and we'll boycott you.

The City Counsel came to the rescue.

Waterbury is only one city. It has a population of less than 150,000, and doesn't cut a very wide swath on the national scene. But what happened there by way of spontaneous resistance to the Bullies is strikingly important. Now New Haven has voted to table Kohler boycott resolutions; and other New England towns, tempted to join in with the UAW, are thinking it over. Remember Waterbury, we can hear the elders saying to each other, behind closed doors, as they argue which side to take.

### *Typical Newscast:*

Suez situation: Critical

Stevenson's accusations against GOP: Serious

Eisenhower's golf score: Good



# NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

## *Mr. Dulles Finds Himself*

The Eisenhower State Department has, at long last, found its *métier*. For three and a half frustrating years, its primary mission in international crises had been to shore up faltering allies; it had performed unenthusiastically, ineptly—usually unsuccessfully. But from the moment Col. Nasser seized the Canal, the Department has carried out its assignment with a dash, a single-mindedness, a resourcefulness that no one would have dreamed the old girl had in her. Leading a Western retreat—persuading intransigent allies to knuckle under—here is something that the State Department is unquestionably good at.

Consider the problem that confronted Mr. Dulles and his associates at the outset. The U.S.'s No. 1 ally had received a potentially mortal blow—not, heaven knows, to its prestige, which had long since been interred—but to its domestic economy. Even if Britain could survive the throttling of her Suez commerce, she was not likely to survive confiscation of her Middle East oil assets, to which the Suez seizure was manifestly a prelude. In 1942, when Marshal Rommel was the enemy, Britain had tapped her empire's last resources—at the expense, even, of the home island's defenses—to stave off these very consequences.

The U.S.'s No. 2 ally (according to State Department ranking) was threatened, if not more seriously, at least more imminently. France's position in North Africa was the only thing that stood between her and fifth-rate power status. And Col. Nasser's intrigues, France fervently believed, were at the margin making it impossible for her to hold that position. Should Nasser succeed at Suez, France's North African tenure could be estimated in terms of months.

In a word, the U.S.'s major allies were drowning, and for motives no more complicated nor any less compelling than the instinct to live, were inclined to try to swim. The State Department's mission was to talk

them out of swimming—no mean task under the circumstances, by any man's standards.

Consider the Department's problem, also, in terms of the threat to America's own interests. As he undertook "Operation Restraint," no one knew better than Mr. Dulles that the real aggressor at Suez was not Nasser, but the Kremlin; and that the real danger was not that Egypt would control the Canal, but that the U.S.'s mortal enemy, the Soviet Union, would.

The ultimate consequences of Nasser's action were too horrendous to contemplate. Should Nasser, under Soviet auspices, successfully defy the West, Soviet influence would instantly permeate the entire Mediterranean basin. Arab claims against other free world assets—not only against its oil wells, but against American air bases in North Africa—would follow. No one, not even one with Mr. Dulles' infinite capacity for finding a bright side to things, could hope that Britain and France would, or could, help defend U.S. air bases if the U.S. failed them at Suez.

Not the least of the State Department's problems, then, was to fight clear of the temptation to promote American security interests at the expense of failing in its larger mission, that of "keeping the peace." This demanded, among other things, a domestic public relations performance that would keep the Soviet Union out of the picture.

The Eisenhower State Department proved equal to all its tasks—and in the process provided pretty impressive answers to the unkind things its critics have said about it.

"It has not provided world leadership," as Mr. Stevenson has charged? From the moment Nasser made his move, the Eisenhower State Department majestically assumed unquestioned command of Western diplomacy.

"It has no ideas, no imagination," as

Messrs. Acheson and Kennan have complained? Ideas have been coming out of Mr. Dulles' ears. For every "new proposal" he brought to the plate, he had another waiting on deck and a third ready in the hole. When Britain and France took an inordinately firm attitude at the outset of the crisis, Mr. Dulles proposed an "international conference." When he got his conference, he proposed—and B&F reluctantly endorsed—an "international board" to run the Canal. When Nasser turned that down, and B's & F's backs stiffened, he was ready with the "international users' association." Before Sir Anthony had caught his breath after relaying to Commons the "association" idea, Dulles made sure that it, too, would fail to budge Nasser: the U.S., he announced, would boycott the Canal rather than enforce the users' rights to use it. Of course, he added the next day, it wouldn't be a real boycott either. And just in case Britain and France still had notions of fighting rather than falling into step with the latest American *démarche*, Mr. Dulles had yet another proposal: America would furnish B&F with dollar loans with which to purchase Western Hemisphere oil—i.e., America would pay its allies not to fight!

"It places too much reliance on military alliances," as the entire Liberal machine has insisted? The Eisenhower State Department has deserted America's Atlantic allies in their supreme moment, and has thus, in all likelihood, eased a torpedo into NATO. Now that ought to satisfy Mr. Dulles' critics.

As for Adlai Stevenson's very favorite charge that the U.S. has paid too much attention to the Communist aspects of international affairs, Mr. Dulles has been careful, this time, to keep things in their proper perspective. Except for an almost petulant complaint that the Soviet Foreign Minister had not been "cooperative" at the London conference, the Eisenhower State Department has resolutely resisted any temptation to connect the Suez situation with the Soviet Union.

No informed observer in Washington professes doubt as to where this will all end up. There will be no war

(Continued on p. 21)

# Reflections on a Right-Wing Protest

Mr. Oliver covers a right-wing rally in Memphis and finds confusion, antagonisms, resentment—and a passionate desire for freedom

REVILO OLIVER

In Memphis, on the fourteenth and fifteenth of this month, a conservative revolt burst into flame. What you saw in the National States' Rights Conference depended on where you looked. If you looked at the heart of the blaze, you saw a single fire of common purpose. If you looked at its edges, you saw only divergent flames, each jetting upward apart from its fellows, flickering a moment, and vanishing in the night.

The conference was composed of factions which can be sorted out into four distinct groups. They were united by their indignation at the major political parties which have, for all practical purposes, combined into a monopoly that offers to the American people only a frivolous choice between Socialism with a broad grin and Socialism with a pseudo-intellectual stare.

The convention was in the absolute control of the Southern "States' Rights" bloc, essentially a revival of the "Dixiecrats" who revolted against Truman in 1948. Their objective is the same: to throw the election into the House of Representatives, in which each state will have one vote. This would place the conservative South in a strong position for bargaining, and the national plunge toward collectivism could, perhaps, be checked by the most familiar of all political devices, a deal.

The iron hand of this bloc, though elegantly clad in the velvet of Southern courtesy, was evident from the moment that rules of procedure were, in effect, proclaimed rather than adopted at the opening session. What many of the other Southerners and most of the Northerners mistook for arrogance was really fear.

The States' Rights bloc was most of all afraid that, despite their care in issuing invitations, some agitator, either anti-Semitic by conviction or a Communist simulating anti-

Semitism, might somehow gain the floor, if only for a moment, and so provide the Liberals with a pretext for the kind of smear that is the most deadly poison in American politics. In the convention itself there was no evidence of even the slightest basis for the Southerners' fear.

There was, to be sure, a momentary interruption by a woman whose incoherent words seemed to claim that criticism of the United Nations was somehow an aspersion on the musical talents of Mischa Elman. She *could* have been an *agent provocateur*, but in all probability she was merely hysterical. She left the Southerners so jittery, however, that an attempt to speak from the floor produced a precipitate recess and a riot squad of stalwart policemen—and some amusement when it was discovered that the suppressed speaker was merely attempting to call for political union of all conservative groups.

The States' Righters were also determined to prevent, and did prevent, an overt move to form a new national party. All of the speakers vigorously denounced the Republican-Democratic merger and its totalitarian orientation; some, including Clarence Manion, who delivered the keynote oration in a public session before an enthusiastic audience of some three thousand, openly called for a new—a *second* party. But the dread word "party" and its usual concomitants appeared in none of the resolutions. A "conference" adopted a "declaration of principles" and "endorsed" as candidates T. Coleman Andrews and Thomas H. Werdel.

This evasion, made absolutely necessary by political realities in the Southern states, excited resentment and even irresponsible charges of "sabotage" among groups that knew nothing of the pertinent election laws, the jealous vigilance of existing political machines, and the fact that the

horrors of Reconstruction gave to the name "Democratic" such emotional potency that a large body of Southern voters could not turn to another party without "feeling that Grandpappy is turning in his grave."

## The Constitution Party

But despite the bloc's determination, a new national party stalked through their halls, and it required all their *savoir faire* to pretend that it was merely a ghost. While the States' Rights Conference was meeting in the Chisca Hotel, the Constitution Party was holding a convention of its own in the Peabody.

The Constitution Party, organized in Texas in 1950, has its principal strength in that state, but it has now attained considerable support in California, small organizations in six other states, and nominal representation in several others. Its platform, almost shockingly free of the cautious verbiage and calculated ambiguity that the major parties use to disguise their intent, is an uncompromising statement of conservative American principles. The most striking are: 1) "Recognize . . . the basic constitutional principle that each state is a . . . sovereign republic with full jurisdiction . . . over the health, safety, education, morals, and general well-being of its people." 2) "Repeal the Federal Income Tax." 3) "Restore a redeemable currency and the right of individuals to own precious metals." 4) "Withdraw the United States from the United Nations." 5) "Restore the protection of our laws . . . to all members of our armed forces serving abroad." 6) "Allow agriculture to resume its rightful place in the free market without governmental regulation." 7) "Insure the right to work to all our people." And 8) "Provide absolute protection of our Constitution . . . from trea-



ties and/or executive agreements."

Whether the Liberal brain-washing of a whole generation of Americans in the schools and the corruption of bribed masses have gone so far as to make such an assertion of the principles on which the United States was founded seem fantastic to the voters is uncertain. The question, however, has little to do with the factors that make the future of the party obscure.

It is undoubtedly a group of political amateurs—responsible and sober citizens driven to action by a sense of imminent danger to their personal liberty and integrity. The membership consists largely of business and professional men of modest means. The party is obviously impecunious. It has little or no experience of the sordid realities of ward politics that deliver votes. Of the members present at Memphis only two, so far as I could observe, possess the oratorical fluency and personal "dynamism" requisite for political leadership.

The party's founder and chairman, Philip Lee Eubank of San Antonio, is a gentle, silver-haired man of indubitable sincerity: slow of speech, unassuming in manner, unfailingly considerate, physically frail.

I am informed that the party entertains wild hopes of carrying Texas with congressional and gubernatorial candidates as well as with Presidential electors pledged to Andrews and Werdel.

The third segment at Memphis consisted of various Citizens' Councils and similar groups primarily concerned by the question of segregation in the schools and aroused by the events which took place in Clinton, Tennessee, of which I received accounts from three eye-witnesses. Into a small Southern town on a Saturday night, when the streets were filled with orderly shoppers and people waiting to hear invited speakers, charged thirty-nine carloads of state police with shrieking sirens and ostentatiously displayed riot guns. They were followed by five hundred soldiers with loaded rifles and fixed bayonets and—at a safe distance—by the histrionic Governor of Tennessee resplendent in a glittering battle-helmet. There was, to be sure, no massacre, but the scene must have strangely resembled the scenes in Czechoslovakia when battalions of

storm troopers, supported by the inevitable tanks, arrived to exterminate the population of a luckless village. Such ostentatious terrorization of a helpless civilian population has outraged the South.

The fourth part of the convention was a chaos of impressive but shadowy names. The North evidently contains a bewildering number of small conservative or pseudo-conservative organizations. I attempted to analyze the situation in one state. Its "delegation" at Memphis included twelve persons who represented seven distinct organizations; five other groups in the state decided to "boycott" the convention; there are two others of which I could learn only the names, and there are doubtless some of which I have never heard. Each group seemed to have only the most hazy conception of the strength and real aims of the others—if, indeed, it had known of their existence. The dominant sentiment was mutual suspicion, not unnatural among strangers or rivals, but, in at least two cases, certainly justified.

I venture no prediction concerning the future of conservative parties. Trustworthy information which I partly verified indicates that there were present at Memphis as observers at least three men of means who were prepared to make substantial contributions (thousands, *not* millions) to a conservative movement that seemed likely to be politically effective. The report is that they left with their checkbooks unopened.

### *Driven to Action*

The most remarkable thing about the convention was the character of the majority of delegates. There were so many citizens who had never before indulged in any political activity beyond voting. They were farmers and farmers' wives, merchants, retired army officers, presidents of small banks, young professional men. They had been driven to political action by the belated discovery that they had, in effect, been disfranchised by the Establishment.

In the North everyone who circulated petitions for independent electors discovered that most merchants, managers, physicians, dentists, lawyers, contractors were afraid to sign lest they bring upon themselves a

vicious boycott or reprisals by the local political machines. In the South there have been a number of actual cases of reprisal. Distributors and local representatives of large corporations have had their contracts cancelled because they dared to champion States' Rights. To be a conservative today is knowingly to run the risk that an admitted Communist ran thirty years ago. Perhaps a greater risk, for the self-styled Liberal is so often buoyed up by a quasi-religious fanaticism. Any cruelty to his fellow man may seem justified as he reflects on the perversity of those who oppose his desire to create a perfect world in which human animals will rejoice in antiseptic kennels, sloth and vulgar amusements, knowing no sense of freedom except freedom from responsibilities, moral considerations, and care for the morrow.

Even among the most composed conservatives at Memphis one sensed a certain urgency, a hidden fear that 1956 may represent their last chance. a realization that even that chance is a desperate gamble. The recent conservative reverses, climaxed by the defeat of Governor Lee in Utah, came as unpleasant surprises. I saw little evidence of confidence in the possible influence of Nixon at any time in the future; he is distrusted almost as much as Eisenhower, Stevenson and Kefauver.

From an experienced political observer who stood on the side lines in Memphis I heard an explanation of Stassen's ostentatious effort to prevent the renomination of Mr. Nixon. It was, he said, an *opéra bouffe* staged to convince the remaining conservatives that a) Mr. Nixon is a conservative, and that b) they still retain a measure of influence in the party the Liberals kidnapped in 1952.

Most conservatives profess to make no predictions concerning the future, but some, both in the North and South, admit that they foresee no future but a few years of accelerated socialism and corruption, of constant decay in the international position and security of the country. Then the inevitable war against terrible odds, and conscription of the whole nation. And finally, whoever is victor, naked dictatorship, the rule of uniformed thugs, and the concentration camp for all who obstinately believe in human dignity. Fantastic? I hope so.



# The Campaign

SAM M. JONES

## The Lull

There comes in every Presidential campaign a seemingly dead period in political fermentation. The outcome is no longer a copper-riveted cinch. The dough is in the oven, the heat is on, but the cake is just beginning to bake. The candidates have been named. The issues (?) have been drawn. The defamation has begun. But a decisive percentage of the electorate has yet to make up its mind.

There have been some significant changes in recent weeks. Democrats have tangible reasons to hope for victory. Republicans have valid cause to fear defeat. But the election is yet to be won or lost. Barring the never-to-be-discounted "unexpected development," the party with superior organization and more convincing propaganda has the better chance of converting the undecided vote.

Money is no problem to either side. Because of Labor's allegiance to the Democratic cause both sides are well financed. For lack of issues, each candidate must make his non-competitive wares sound better than his rival's, in the manner of a TV eulogy of Super-Goo Shampoo. Scarcely more than a month remains for these productions: by the third week of October only a thunderbolt could change what's cooking. The opinions of the ear-weary, glazed-eye voter will then have crystallized.

## Interim Notes

Authoritative Republican sources in the state of Washington privately concede that Governor Langlie has almost no chance to catch up with Senator Magnuson's apparent lead.

Oregon observers believe that Douglas McKay is playing a crafty waiting game, content to appear as underdog, but confident of victory over Wayne Morse in a whirlwind finish. The Republican State Committee has, in addition, launched a formidable weapon against ex-Republican, ex-Independent, currently Democratic Senator Morse—his own voting

record. The Senator may not be all things to all men but he clearly has been on all sides of every question.

Impartial analysts see Republican Senator Case as "safe" in South Dakota, and Senator Hickenlooper in Iowa. Republican Senator Welker is reported in serious trouble in his bid for re-election in Idaho.

Democratic Senator Bible is given the edge to retain his seat in Nevada.

California Republicans are speeding up their effort to re-elect Senator Kuchel against toughening opposition. Wisconsin, once a GOP stronghold, is a borderline state this year, but the Democrats still have an uphill fight to oust Senator Wiley despite strong antipathy in his own party.

The rosy Republican outlook in Kentucky of only a short time ago has been rapidly changing. Democrats, who were almost resigned to losing one seat, and were fearful of losing both, are now confident of no loss.

Illinois Democrats are far from discouraged in their attempt to unseat Senator Dirksen.

Republicans in Pennsylvania acknowledge Senator Duff is trailing.

In Connecticut, where conservative Republican Vivian Kellems claims a third place on the ballot, Democrats are confident that Representative Dodd will replace Senator Bush.

There is no question that, at the moment, the political winds are less favorable for the GOP than they were a few weeks ago. The prospect of a Democratic-controlled House has reached the point where most speculation concerns only the size of the Democratic majority. Most Republican candidates now realize that coattailing the President is a futile business. They must stand on their own or go down.

## Press Conference

It is a rarity when a candidate for high office lets the Washington press corps cool its heels. Nevertheless, the audience that waited for Mr. Stevenson in the Park Sheraton Hotel was patient, polite, docile. When he ap-

peared, Mr. Stevenson said he was sorry, but he had been trying to anticipate some of the questions and had been putting his answers in writing. The explanation was well received.

Mr. Stevenson was pleasant, relaxed, charming if not scintillating. With few exceptions, the questions were less than aggressive. The atmosphere was tepid. The scene suggested a classroom in which a majority of eager students were asking a much admired professor to explain some of the finer points on a mildly controversial subject. The few impertinent scholars who challenged dogma instead of requesting enlightenment were answered with circumlocution or were gently chided.

The one question which bothered Mr. Stevenson (and may bother him much more before the campaign is over) concerned his disagreement with Harry Truman on the guilt of Alger Hiss. In 1952 the Governor stated: "I have never doubted the verdict of the jury that convicted him." Quoting that statement, Mr. Stevenson now added: "Nothing has happened since then to change my views. Now, if what I said four years ago places me in disagreement with what President Truman says now, that is where the record must lie, must rest."

In response to an earlier question, the Democratic candidate declared that Communism is not an issue in this campaign (citing President Eisenhower as his authority). Shortly thereafter he added: "The Republican leaders are evidently worried about the campaign and I am not surprised to find Nixon, Hall and others back on the same low road. . . ." Governor Stevenson referred to the Vice President of the United States and to the Chairman of the Republican National Committee without benefit of title or prefix, but he spoke of Mr. Hiss. Perhaps some of the reporters who tried in vain to edge in a question might have asked the Governor to state plainly whether he considered Mr. Hiss a traitor as well as a perjurer; but the chance never came.

The big press conference "to pinpoint the issues" failed to pinpoint anything except the unquestionable rapport between Mr. Stevenson and most Washington correspondents.

# Letter from London

F. A. VOIGT

## British Labor Swings Left

The meeting of the British Trade Union Congress at Brighton marked a shift towards the Left, increased pressure in favor of a planned economy, and a further weakening of the national solidarity which came almost overnight when Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal Company.

In spite of their professions of cosmopolitan sentiment, their concern for what they call the "underdeveloped countries," their passion for foreign affairs, and their advocacy of the United Nations as the only agency capable of settling international conflicts, the British unions treat their own country's economy as though it existed in isolation. They persist in the belief that there is, somewhere, a reservoir of wealth that can still be shared out. They continue to skip the fact that in other industrial countries increased wages have, on the whole, been proportionate to increased productivity, but in Britain this has not been so.

This, the crux of Great Britain's economic problem, was not seriously discussed at Brighton. Altogether, the discussions were exceedingly poor in realistic analysis and exceedingly rich in moral exhortations.

For many years there have been complaints that the leaders of the British trade unions are "too old." But when common sense was talked at Brighton, it came almost exclusively from the older leaders. In Great Britain, today, pomposity appears to be the special privilege of youth—though "youth" among trade union leaders may include a year or two past the half century. Thus, Mr. Frank Cousins, the leader of the powerful General Transport Workers' Union, with a membership of 1,300,000, is regarded as one of the "younger" leaders at the age of fifty-one. All observers, no matter where their sympathies lie, seem to regard Mr. Cousins as the "coming man" of the British trade union movement. It is he above all who has given the Congress its new radical twist and

brought to an end the truce concluded between the unions and the government five years ago.

The Trade Union Congress has, against the advice of the older leaders, begun to usurp the functions of the Labor Party. It has become political although union membership is not conditional on political affiliations. (In the last general elections, nearly a third of the trade union vote went to the Conservative Party.)

The National Union of Railwaymen, which recently secured a very substantial rise in wages for the railway workers, declared "we refuse to forgo our right to demand upward adjustment in our wage standards." This "right" is not contested. What is contested is the immoderate use of this "right" in the developing situation. Like the other unions, the Railwaymen's Union showed real recognition of the need for higher production except in a few industries. Its solution for the dilemma which foreign competition is imposing on British trade and industry: "a planned economy" and an "all-out offensive against profits."

The Trade Union Congress has no particular qualifications to pronounce on foreign affairs. The British Federation of Industries would be far better qualified by virtue of its knowledge and experience, but it does not attempt to prescribe foreign policies to the Government. The rank and file of trade union members is, for the most part, utterly indifferent to matters of foreign—or any other—policy. But for the more active members (among whom, of course, the Communists are the most active) foreign affairs exercise irresistible attraction.

The Trade Union Congress represents more people in Great Britain than any other institution excepting Parliament, and it considers itself hardly less important than the United Nations. When it meets, its attitude towards the Western powers is that of a headmaster surveying a class

of small boys and distributing commendation or reproof, without any regard for the interests of Great Britain or the Commonwealth. Great Britain under a Conservative Government is, of course, the bad boy, though there is one who is worse—so bad that he is hardly ever mentioned—namely: Spain. Egypt, personified by Colonel Nasser, has been a little naughty, though he had a perfect right to nationalize the Canal Company. But a reprimand will be enough—and an admonition, urging the Egyptian Government "to exhibit statesmanship." The favorite, the model child, so good and so precocious as to be a sort of infant prodigy, is India as personified by Dr. Nehru.

It is admitted—the Government knows it perfectly well—that the use of force against Egypt will be dangerous, not so much because of any resistance Egypt herself may offer, but because of the repercussions throughout the Moslem world. But it is clear, also, that to give way to Egypt will also be dangerous—much more so, in fact, in the considered opinion of the Government and even its most cautious supporters (among whom there is deep disappointment over what they rightly or wrongly regard as the failure of the American Administration to appreciate the justice of this opinion).

The weakness of the case put by the opposition is that it can offer no alternative to force except capitulation—and capitulation is not to be thought of save by the *New Statesman & Nation*, the *Daily Mirror*, the *Tribune*, and sundry members of Parliament. The *New Statesman & Nation*, with a perfidy that has become habitual, is trying to raise a war-scare: it characterized a past weekend as perhaps "the last weekend of normal argument and sane thinking."

But instead of recognizing that there is no alternative, the whole opposition—which now includes the Trade Union Congress, the Labor Party and the Liberals—has resorted to an evasion. It insists that the dispute be submitted to the United Nations, although Mr. Gaitskell and all who are with him know that the Soviet Union will use her veto in the Security Council and that the Communist and the Bandung powers can together pack the Assembly.



# How Conservatives Should Vote

## Support the Outs

I think I have followed in my own activity the duties and opportunities of our American political system. Prior to the Republican Convention I worked for Senator Taft; after it, I worked for candidate Eisenhower as an instrument for getting rid of the Truman crowd. When the Eisenhower team in office staged its raid on Congress with the McCarthy hearing, I no longer liked Ike.

In early 1954 I followed the efforts of the Ike team to purge my kind of Republican and to palaver with Communism as an allowable doctrine. I saw Vishinsky, and later Bulganin and Khrushchev, become sacred cows of our American newspapers. And there were other unpardonable sins such as repeal of the excess profits tax and accelerated amortization for big business. I tried to develop an interest in retiring our radical Senator Humphrey, but found key factors in the Republican Party here uninterested in stopping Humphrey.

In the last day for primary filing, I announced that I was leaving the Republican Party. I filed against Humphrey in the Democratic Party to publicize my change. In this 1954 election the Eisenhower Republicans lost all the state offices but one, made a fiasco of opposing Humphrey, and lost one congressional seat to a woman. Later in the Presidential primary of 1956 some insurgent Democrats challenged the Party machine successfully, and I like to think that I helped in that result.

I am now supporting the out-party ticket, in spite of Stevenson and Kefauver, both because it is the out-party and because a Democratic victory would keep Southern conservatives in control of Congress. Unless this occurs, the Republican Party is a dead duck. The Ike team is trying to revolutionize its own party. It is so anxious to destroy the conservative Republicans that it keeps up the fight in 1956. In a Democratic Congress the conservative Republicans would be free of White House domination and probably able to rebuild their Republican Party.

Mound, Minn.

A. B. GILBERT

Herewith we publish a first installment of answers from our readers to our query "What should conservatives do about the coming election?" We shall publish further answers in the coming weeks, but no letter can be considered which is received after October 10. For each letter published we will pay five dollars. We regret that letters cannot be returned or acknowledged. Address them to: Election Editor, NATIONAL REVIEW, 211 E. 37th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

## Grandmother Image

The Institute for Motivational Research has recently concluded that Mr. Eisenhower is the father image and that Mr. Stevenson is the neighbor's father image. The Institute suggests that persons who wanted, but did not have, an ideal father will vote for Ike and that the paternally content may go for Adlai.

Nixon, I suppose, must be the son image; at least he weeps when he's been bad. As we say in Brooklyn, leave us not consider in what image Estes was cast.

Father will probably win, but the day he does, having become worse than useless to all his numerous household progeny, he will begin the first lesson in grand disillusionment by Constitutional Amendment.

Personally, having spent my childhood sticking pins in effigies, I think of Eisenhower as *everybody's* grandmother.

I shall spend Election Day, all day, reading a book on psychiatry at whatever Library happens to be open. *Brightwaters, N.Y.*

C. M. PARKINSON

## Vote Republican

"What should conservatives do about the coming election?"

Assuming this question relates to the question of how to vote, the answer must be resolved on the principle of selecting the less of two evils. Admitting, sadly, that the Republicans are nearly as socialistic in their prac-

tices as are the Democrats, the decision will have to be based on the general decency of behavior of the respective leaders and spokesmen for the two parties.

Upon the above basis the balance is heavily loaded against the Democrats by the vile tongue and loud mouth of their erstwhile President, whose record for lack of veracity is abysmal, and whose tolerance of rottenness while in office was an affront to the nation. Also the present nominees are both palpably politicians who are ready to say anything in order to win.

On the other hand, the Republican leader, while weak-kneed, and wobbly on many issues the conservative deems important, is nevertheless a clean-mouthed, kind and honest American who places duty ahead of expediency. Hence we should vote Republican.

Randolph, N.H.

ALVAN L. DAVIS

## Concentrate on Congress

About the only constructive thing that conservatives can do this year is to concentrate on electing a conservative Congress, one which will be able to block the Liberal-collectivist programs of Messrs. Eisenhower and Stevenson. Even this plan is not applicable everywhere, as, for example, in New York State, where voters will be confronted with two ADA candidates for the Senate, Mayor Wagner (Democratic) and Attorney-General Javits (Republican).

New York City

HERBERT NADLER

## Vote Conservative

We American conservatives face a grave crisis in the forthcoming election. Our hopes in the Eisenhower "crusade" of 1952 have been proven false.

There is no gain for us in supporting the Republican national ticket. The Eisenhower Palace Guard has amply demonstrated that its sole interest in us is to keep us voting Republican while it silently renders us impotent in GOP councils.

What hope is there in supporting



a party whose chief ideologist, Arthur Larson, considers Dean Acheson "a moderate and a conservative," and claims credit for the Republicans for inventing the New Deal?

Not the Democrats, but the Eisenhower Administration was responsible for the censure of Senator McCarthy. The entire scheme was instigated by the White House . . . It was not the Democrats, but the Palace Guard, who blocked the Bricker Amendment. Eisenhower, not Lyndon Johnson, vetoed the natural gas bill. The Eisenhower Administration vastly broadened Social Security, advocated Federal aid to education and pushed public housing.

In the field of foreign affairs, the Eisenhower Administration stands equally condemned. The Geneva Conference, the greatest debacle since Potsdam, ushered in an era of appeasement so cowardly as to make even a Dean Acheson blanch. The Korean truce demoralized our allies in Asia, and was a great Communist victory. Our appeasement is causing the Germans to waver, and we have destroyed forever the hopes of the enslaved satellite peoples for deliverance.

The rights of the states have suffered their greatest setbacks under this Administration. The Tenth Amendment stands ignored, and the Supreme Court has been further packed with persons wholly contemptuous of even the basic principles of American jurisprudence.

In short, the Eisenhower Administration represents a virtual antithesis to what we stand for. How can we, in good conscience, vote for its continuance?

We have no haven in the Democratic Party of Walter Reuther, the ADA, Atlantic Union, and Estes Kefauver. Even so, they are little worse than the Republicans.

I believe that a vote for either of the two leading contenders is a wasted vote. Why should we vote for what we do not believe in? The time has come to declare ourselves independent of ambiguous and leftist doctrines, and stand alone. We must no longer let ourselves be manipulated by callous politicians whose doctrine is "they have nowhere else to go."

There is hope on the scene. States' Rights Democrats and Constitutional Republicans have united to form a

new party, nominating T. Coleman Andrews for President and Thomas H. Werdel for Vice President. Andrews is the former Internal Revenue Commissioner who had the courage to resign in protest against the iniquitous income tax. Thomas Werdel is a former California Congressman who vigorously fought the New Dealism of Earl Warren.

On this ticket our hopes must ride. If it does well, the larger parties will be forced to lend an ear to us, for if they do not, we will have "somewhere to go." But if too many of us are lulled into supporting "the lesser of two evils," and our party does poorly, then the opportunist Liberal politicians who gloat that we have "nowhere to go" will be reaffirmed in their belief; those who so bravely risked their careers and finances for us will be ruined, and we will have forever passed the point of no return.

Charleston, West Va. CLARK WOODROE

### *Prettier Poison*

There was a man who on preparing to retire found his bed occupied by two snakes. One was a dynamically conservative coral snake and the other a quite liberal king cobra. Since the coral snake was smaller and much the prettier of the two, he dispossessed the king cobra and went to bed.

New York City DAN CANAVAN

### *The Roar Is Niagara*

You ask: "What should conservatives do about the coming election?"

The answer to this query depends somewhat on residence. If he lives, say, in Vermont and Georgia, the conservative voter has complete freedom of choice. He may vote for the majority party's candidates on all levels, or he may split his ticket, voting for either side, but concentrating his attention upon the races for Congress, for Senate and for his State-local favorites, or go fishing.

In the areas that count heavily, in the North and Border States, there is no good reason for real conservatives to sulk in the cave Adullam and lament the evils of the world. True, the Republicans are not thoroughly imbued with conservatism as dogma. But a careful study of the two party platforms this year, with

especial reference to maintenance of the Federal Reserve Board as an independent agency; the provision for tax reduction *only* upon achieving budgetary equilibrium and payments made on the national debt; the refusal to underwrite practically every public power site with Federal funds; refusal of labor bosses' demands for outright repeal of Taft-Hartley Act; agricultural relief without rigid parity price supports and a Neo-"Brannan Plan"; these and many other items should be a fair test of Republican intentions.

Perhaps of more importance than platforms are the candidates. Glancing back at the record of Eisenhower and Nixon, can the true conservative see anything in their performance which would be done more moderately, more sanely and more in consonance with American historical development by Stevenson and Kefauver?

Given one year with the Democrats in control of the Executive and the Congress, we may well have: (1) war (2) skyrocketing inflation and monstrous giveaways (3) stultification of the legislative process (4) re-packing of the Courts with men of leftist predilections.

Therefore, in my judgment, conservatives should bend their backs to the oars, for what they hear is Niagara!

Chattanooga, Tenn. FRANK W. PRESCOTT

### *Pick Your Own Candidates*

I do not think the conservatives' dilemma will be solved by staying away from the polls on election day—keeping silent does no good. Our "leaders" can't hear silence and will go on giving us candidates they think will win because they will pick up the "liberal" or "Irish," "Jewish," "Negro," "Italian," or what have you vote (although what's wrong with the "American" vote, I'll never know!)

So, we must find some way to yell—perhaps a write-in vote for Knowland, Jenner or Andrews, and for Robert Morris or someone similar for New York Senator. Or vote for the candidates chosen by the conservatives at their convention. Anything will be better than keeping quiet!

DOROTHY PICKERING  
Rockaway Beach, N.Y.

# Letter from Taipei

FREDA UTLEY

## *Formosa: The Shame and the Glory*

In 1938, when China had been fighting for more than a year alone and unaided against the full might of the Japanese Warlords, I visited several sections of the front near Hankow. In those days the Chinese Nationalist forces marched on straw-sandalled feet and when wounded had little hope of being cared for. The Chinese Army Medical Corps and Red Cross had very few trucks, almost no ambulances, and not even quinine to prevent malaria which caused more deaths than Japanese guns.

Years later, in 1946, I was in China during General Marshall's disastrous mission, when he embargoed all arms and ammunition to the Nationalist Government unless and until it would submit to Moscow by agreeing to form a "coalition government" with the Communists.

Today, thanks to American aid supplied only after the Korean war began, the armed forces of our old and loyal ally, the National Government of China, are far better equipped and trained than any of the troops it had on the mainland. They also have an astonishingly high morale, sustained by faith that they can and will liberate the mainland and be united with their families. The irony of the situation lies in the fact that today they are not allowed to fight. Having been deprived of American arms, ammunition and moral support during the critical postwar years of the Acheson-Marshall-Truman era, during which America helped to deliver China to Communist domination, they are now "leashed" by Washington's desire for "peaceful coexistence" with the Communist Empire in Europe and Asia.

I felt a sense of shame—on my visit to the Chinese Navy in the southern port of Kaoshiung; on a trip, with U.S. General Bogart (acting head of MAAG), to observe Chinese Army maneuvers near Taipei; and in talks with Chinese officers and cadets at the War College and Air

Force Academy down south. Shame because—after seeing the great effort which the men and officers of Free China's armed forces are making to bring themselves as close as possible to American standards of efficiency, and after hearing, again and again, the word "mainland" on so many lips—I felt that all these people are being cheated by us. Their government, and also no doubt their senior officers, know that American military aid is given only for "defensive" purposes, thus precluding an invasion of the mainland unless and until it suits American interests to "unleash" them.

But I wonder how many of the rank and file and junior officers realize that the armed forces of the Republic of China are in effect simply guarding the outer line of America's Pacific defense? Guarding it for us at far less cost than if American divisions had to defend Formosa, as American officers helping to train the Chinese armed forces frankly admit. Not only because a Chinese soldier is content if he has enough to eat and a few cents pocket money, or because the junior officers of the Chinese Army and Navy earn less than pedicab drivers in Taipei, but also because, although we supply arms and equipment, the main burden of feeding, clothing and paying the 700,000 men of the Chinese Nationalist armed forces is borne by the Chinese themselves. This is far too great a burden for a population of less than ten million, which also has to support the 110,000 officials of the National Government and its embassies abroad—not to speak of the quarter million students in schools and colleges and large numbers of refugees from Communist China. Eighty per cent of budget expenditures go for support of the military establishment, and one cannot but conclude that so long as we use the Nationalist forces as part of our Pacific defenses while refusing to help or permit them to liberate China, we should feel ob-

ligated to assume at least part of the burden of their maintenance.

Yet, whereas other nations which have received far more financial and military assistance from the U.S. (while contributing little or nothing to American security) are continually griping, the Chinese on Formosa are embarrassingly grateful for our aid.

When I asked Captain Mou—described to me by an officer on Admiral Anderson's staff as the "best handler" of ships in the Chinese Navy—why the Chinese did not tell us off for our foolish foreign policy, he replied: "Chinese tradition and Confucian tenets teach us to blame ourselves, not others."

On this and other occasions, I thought that Chinese politeness, restraint, old-world traditions or Confucian morality are perhaps a greater handicap to the Chinese Government-in-exile than its lack of guns, ships or an adequate industrial base. It might be more salutary for all of us if the Chinese did not scrupulously refrain from expressing any criticism of our ambiguous foreign policy, thus leaving a clear field for neutralists like Nehru to influence American opinion. Instead they wait, with stoical patience, for America to realize that "the security of the United States depends on the Pacific, as does that of Rome on the Mediterranean. America can never be secure until there is a democratic government on the mainland."

These were the words spoken to me by Yu Ta-wei, the present Chinese Minister of Defense, whom I knew a decade ago on the mainland when, as Minister of Communications, he was endeavoring to repair the railways wrecked by the Japanese and the Communists. We were returning from a day spent on the offshore island of Quemoy, where the Chinese Nationalist forces face Communist China across a strip of shallow water, only two miles broad at its narrowest point, and where one can observe through a telescope all the details of the Communist construction of airfields and causeways for the attack they dare not make—unless and until they are assured that America is so bent on peaceful coexistence at any price that we shall not fight to defend our loyal allies in the Far East.



# THE LAW OF THE LAND

C. DICKERMAN WILLIAMS

## *The Supreme Court's Doubtful Analogy*

The opinion of the Supreme Court late last spring, holding invalid state "right to work" laws as applied to employees subject to the Railway Labor Act, drew an analogy between compulsory union membership and the "integrated bar": "On the present record, there is no more an infringement or impairment of First Amendment rights than there would be in the case of a lawyer who by state law is required to be a member of an integrated bar."

This comment has created the impression among some people that all lawyers are required to belong to an organization roughly comparable to a labor union. The facts are quite to the contrary.

The so-called "integrated bar" exists in only a few states, of which California and Michigan are the most important. Its objective is the discipline of unethical lawyers.

In New York, at least, the argument was made in the 1920's that lawyers of the second generation of immigrants were disposed to take unscrupulous advantage of others of the same national and racial antecedents and, in general, did not show the traditional high principles of the legal profession. Therefore, it was maintained, all lawyers should be taxed so that an aggressive investigating and prosecuting machinery could rid the bar of these unworthy members. The argument was answered by the assertion that private associations—primarily the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and the New York State Bar Association—were already doing the job well enough. The Legislature decided to leave things alone.

In several other states the integrated bar was adopted during the twenties and thirties and continues to exist, although the movement is not active today. In Michigan an annual tax of \$5.00 is levied. In California it is apparently \$7.50. The revenue so raised is used to maintain staffs who listen to the "grievances" of those complain-

ing about their lawyers and in other ways to get after lawyers who may appear to have misbehaved in the practice of law.

The constitutionality of integrated-bar statutes has often been attacked, but the right to levy the fee has always been upheld. The reasoning of the courts has been that the right to practice law is a privilege granted by the state, and that the state may exact a nominal amount from those who enjoy the privilege, to make sure that the privilege is not abused.

Of course, the integrated bar does not negotiate fees as between clients and lawyers; indeed, it has nothing to do with the earnings of the ordinary member. Moreover, unlike labor unions, and also unlike the English and French bar organizations, the integrated bar itself has no disciplinary power over lawyers. If it decides that a particular lawyer has been unethical, the next step is to present the facts to a court. Only the court may



Kreuttner

*"You don't get the point. Legislative encroachment on Executive and Judicial powers is Demagoguery. Executive and Judicial encroachment on Congressional powers is Protection Against Legislative Tyranny."*

penalize the offending attorney.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say that political differences with the officialdom of the integrated bar are not a basis for disciplinary proceedings. (I do not regard questions of loyalty to the United States as "political differences.")

On the other hand, as the Court recognized, the Grand Lodge Constitution of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America prohibits members from "interfering with legislative matters affecting national, state, territorial, dominion or provincial legislation, adversely affecting the interests of our members."

The Constitution of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, many of whose members work for railways, forbids "creating or attempting to create dissatisfaction or dissension among any of the members." Another provision forbids the circulation of "cards, handbills, letters or political literature of any kind . . . in an effort to induce members to vote for or against any candidate for [union] office."

The Court found these and similar provisions irrelevant because Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act precludes any condition of union membership other than "periodic dues, initiation fees, and assessments." "If other conditions are in fact imposed, or if the exaction of dues, initiation fees or assessments is used as a cover for forcing ideological conformity or other action in contravention of the First Amendment [free speech], this judgment will not prejudice the decision in that case."

Unfortunately, the ordinary labor union member is not as articulate as a lawyer, nor as adept at protecting his rights. He may be disciplined without the approval of the court. If he is punished by his union for lack of "ideological conformity," it will be he who must take the matter to the courts to protect himself. If he should lose the case, he is through.

It will be interesting to observe what effective resistance there is on the part of rank and file members to the "ideological conformity" these union constitutional provisions apparently seek to enforce. I should be astonished if it were as effective as the resistance on the part of lawyers, should an integrated bar organization try to impose a similar conformity.



# ARTS and MANNERS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

## *What Do Our Playwrights Read?*

Soon, one Broadway opening will outbore another, and this department will be crowded with terse battle reports. No less than sixty new shows are rapidly moving in on us. The public is game, more so than ever. There is, for instance, a certain musical being prepared starring Ethel Merman, of which no one knows more than the title; yet mail orders for tickets already have piled up in the aggregate sum of close to a million dollars. This, of course, is far more than the whole nation's total annual expenditure on poetry—but I must not prejudge Miss Merman's vehicle which, who knows?, might outsing Robert Frost and Dylan Thomas.

Soon, then, blood will be spilled all over the scene (or what they have lately been using for blood in this era of synthetics), there will be the usual frantic solicitation of audience laughter, and a legion of desperate song-and-dance men will seek attention. So, before the seasonal onslaught sets in, I should like to pause, for the last time in several months, for a leisurely discussion of certain aspects of arts and manners.

For instance, I'd very much like to know what our playwrights are reading—in addition, that is, to their own plays. In spite of all appearances to the contrary, writers *do* read. And there is an unbroken continuity of human concerns being reflected on the stage. The contemporary play, no matter how artificially concocted and how brazenly intended, remains in some ways a valid expression of private yearnings and social preferences. And the contemporary playwright, no matter how vulgar and un-erudite he may be, is still one of the decisive trustees of the racial mind: he, perhaps even more than a Jackie Gleason or an Elvis Presley, determines what part of the cultural heritage shall be carried forward into the confusing tomorrow. He lifts one value from among all the others, endows one separated element of human experience with the total

persuasiveness of the stage. But what has informed the playwright's choice? What, in short, has he been reading?

Now if our wealthy foundations were better advised, they would sponsor this kind of investigation rather than the mass interviews of the Kinsey type. To learn who and what has influenced an effective playwright's mind ought to be incomparably more revealing than all the median figures on the frequency of reprehensible habits of retarded adults. As it is, we don't know. But I suspect that nothing influences our playwrights so much as Sociology, that weirdest of all modern sciences.

Sociology can be safely defined as the use of a jargon invented for that purpose. It is beyond any doubt the most highly subsidized and the phoniest of all human endeavors. It supplies the plush rationale to Madison Avenue and to the innumerable clip joints of "market research" and "public polls" and "audience studies"—to all those places where clever men live on the promise to separate and measure and cater to man's desires and dreams. Sociology, in short, is the philosopher's stone in an indubitably moronic age.

So, in conditioning myself for the hardships of another winter on Broadway, I have been reading Professor Pitirim A. Sorokin's *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences*, easily the funniest scholarly compendium of recent times. Mr. Sorokin, an attractively superior man of letters, takes the claims of Sociology under the microscope of a learned mind—and I, for one, have not laughed so much since Jimmy Durante dissected his piano.

Professor Sorokin prefaces his book most aptly with this quote from Dostoyevsky: "Give to a Russian pupil, ignorant in astronomy, the map of the heavenly bodies; and next day he will bring it corrected." Indeed, the woods are full of Sociologists who have "corrected" the map of our heavenly bodies, and of playwrights

who have dramatized their corrections. How much I felt at home with the contemporary drama, and its ice-cold "scientific" indifference to the moral phenomena of existence, when I read this scolding summarization of Mr. Sorokin's:

Here are a few further examples of perfectly useless home-made terms and of inadequate definitions of the basic psychological phenomena by authors infected by the "operational" and "imitative" speech disorders. "Adience" and "abience" instead of "love" and "dislike." "Enthropy" instead of "habit," "org" and "animorg" instead of "organism" and "animal organism." "Consciousness is an electron-proton aggregation." (A. P. Weiss) Consciousness is "a complex integration and succession of bodily activities which are closely related to or involve the verbal and gestural mechanisms, and hence most frequently come to social expression." (K. S. Lashley) Emotion is "a particular stimulus-response relationship." (W. S. Hunter) According to G. Lundberg, the terms "fear," or "hate" can and should be avoided in scientific description; instead, the respective behavior can be operationally described as the "behavior of an object of specified characteristics reacting to a stimulus of specified characteristics within the specified field of forces."

This (and never mind the purple language) is indeed the pure essence of a contemporary play—just about any contemporary play; the moral and even the psychological dignity of a human situation has been reduced to the gobbledegook of scientism.

Four hundred years ago, a nostalgic Professor Sorokin reminds us, Michel de Montaigne defined man as "a marvelous vain, fickle, and unstable subject, on whom it is very hard to form any certain and uniform judgment." But born into an arrogant modern world, for which Nietzsche could pronounce the death of God, the contemporary playwright has been "liberated" from all reverence for the complexity of creation. And (because even the lowest form of literary creativeness is inconceivable without a set of objective values) he finally grabs the obtuse, certain and uniform charts of Sociology. True, zoologists and botanists would contemptuously reject such unanimated drivel. But when it comes to man, his modern analysts are perfectly satisfied with that jargon of emptiness.

And now bring on Miss Merman!

# BOOKS IN REVIEW

## Social Science in Excelsis

RICHARD M. WEAVER

Social science is a tent covering a wide variety of performances. Nor would it be right to say that they are all of the circus variety. Here in this collection of thirty-one papers and addresses (*The State of the Social Sciences*, University of Chicago Press, \$6.00) one sees the new science on parade, and the differences are striking enough to be reassuring.

Contributions range all the way from the unrelieved horror of inanity and jargon of Murray Horwitz's "Psychological Needs as a Function of Social Environments" to the subtle dialectic in which Leo Strauss reduces to absurdity the relativism embraced by many of his colleagues; from the overweening pretensions of James G. Miller's "Toward a General Theory for the Behavioral Sciences," with its frank dismissal of teleology, to the hard-headed questions propounded in James L. Cate's "Humanism and the Social Sciences."

The question immediately arising is how people of such differing commitments and approaches ever got assembled under one banner. Could it be that some of them have been dragooned into this parade? For the answer, one must go to the modern "success story" of social science, which is largely a tale of invasions and usurpations.

A century ago, the various studies of man were known by a few appropriate and easily decipherable names such as "history," "political economy," and "moral philosophy." But the dazzling success of the physical sciences in altering the external world inspired, if not a black envy, at least a desire to share in the accompanying attention and prestige. As Darwinism and other theories seemed to immerse man more and more completely in nature, it was soon being asked why the methods which had explained so much of the physical world might not explain him also. With this the way was wide open for the materialistic monism which today underlies virtually all "scientific" social science. Henceforward man was to be "nothing but" what the methods of science could reveal him as being.

The oddest fit in the new scientific conglomerate has been history, Science, as everybody knows, is con-

cerned with abstractions, general laws, and the problem of predictability. It seeks out the recurring, because recurrence makes possible predictability, and prediction makes possible manipulation. Therefore the great inductive apparatus of science was turned upon history (especially history that was recent and statistically available) in the expectation of deducing its laws with the same success that had been achieved in the physical world.

One soon discovers that a basic tenet of this branch of social science is that man is always pushed but never pulled; he has "drives" and "strains," but neither freely willed goals nor a destiny. Even that troublesome word "value," so obstructive to the scientific rationalist, will one day be reduced to scientific handling, if we are to believe Mr. Miller. "The total of the strains within the individual resulting from his genetic input and variations in the input from his environment is often referred to as his values. The relative urgency of reducing these individual strains

determines his hierarchy of values." This is what is known as turning "value" into a value-free word, and there are plenty of workers in the enterprise.

Where the new scientific social science and history come to a real parting of the ways is in their grasp of the totality. History is not primarily concerned with abstracting, but with reconstructing unique events that happened in irreversible time. It is made, as Cate observes, "of the warp of individual experience as well as the woof of abstraction." Thus it is history which is broadminded, and social science which is narrow and partial.

Social science, because it has leaped to a premise of the infinite predictability and infinite manipulability of man, looks forward to some millennial reconstruction of society. For this reason, a large number of the members of this school have been political radicals in some measure or other; and those Congressmen who are reported to have confused social science with socialism may not have been so dumb after all. They had the right intuitive perception, even if they got the academic distinctions a little confused. A thing is defined in part by its tendency, and the tendency of scientific social science, from Comte down to our own day, has been toward political and economic collectivism.

The historians, in contrast, have been predominantly conservatives, and their conservatism proceeds from a pessimism about the nature of man as revealed by his story. Here one cannot do better than quote the terrible pronouncement of Acton: "Neither paganism nor Christianity has ever produced a profound political historian whose mind was not turned to gloom by the contemplation of the affairs of men." To this might be added Gibbon's description of history as "the record of the crimes, follies, and misfortunes of mankind."

History in the sense recognized by Acton and Gibbon and the other



great figures admitted the contingent, and the ineluctable, and expressed the truth of tragedy. It contained lessons, but not the kind that can be drawn out of a computing machine. A study making this appraisal of the human record is a far more sobering discipline—a diet calculated to grow hardheads rather than soft eggheads—than the “social stew” on which the modern educationist tries to nourish the young. The latter is usually a concoction of dubious abstractions about human nature and wishful thinking about the structure of reality, with a dash of political ideology from the left.

It may be said for certain that the inscrutable element is still in our lives. The more the social scientists proclaim their imminent control of affairs, the more the world bucks, heaves and reels. That is because, the more one assures himself that he has a complete rational control of his environment, the more he diminishes his actual capacity for dealing with it.

The course which converted the study of man into social scientificism contained a number of illogical steps. It is good to know that there are some men within the general field, like Strauss, Cate and Friedrich Hayek, who are engaged in patiently pointing these out. No one wishes to rest in a complete agnosticism about human nature. But it is better to be conservative about our knowledge and about the perfectibility of man than to court the disasters which would certainly follow the scientific *hubris* evidenced by most of the contributors to this volume.

## Liberty's Hall of Fame

**The Free Man's Library: A Descriptive and Critical Bibliography**, by Henry Hazlitt. 176 pp. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company. \$3.50

Every bibliography, if it is to be more than a list of the kind any graduate student could assemble, should reflect the tastes and attitude of its compiler. This *The Free Man's Library* does extraordinarily well. In the course of bringing together and commenting upon a list of some 500 books on “the philosophy of individualism,” the particular turn of Mr. Hazlitt's mind, the tone and stress

of his criticism give his book a vitality that makes it not only a useful compendium but an interesting one.

What he means by “individualism,” Mr. Hazlitt makes clear, is liberalism in its old sense—in the sense in which it was understood before the modern collectivists captured the term. Indeed, Mr. Hazlitt sometimes substitutes for “individualism” the phrase “true liberalism.” The very fate, however, of this “true liberalism” in the last few decades has created a series of difficulties.

In the first place, the necessity of including in any such bibliography a representative list of anti-Communist books requires the citation of critics of Communism whose general position on other questions is out of harmony with the positive philosophical position of “individualism.” Secondly, the general growth of collectivist and statist ideas has brought about a situation where writers in a very different tradition than that which Mr. Hazlitt espouses are so closely in agreement with many facets of the nineteenth-century liberal tradition that he finds it essential to include their books. Thus, exponents of orthodox nineteenth-century liberalism stand cheek by jowl with anti-Communist socialists, on the one hand, and integral conservatives, on the other. Both of these difficulties are explicitly recognized in the Introduction.

But there is a third difficulty, one which Mr. Hazlitt seems to overlook. The same developments of the twentieth century that have so strikingly confirmed the validity of nineteenth-century liberalism's economic principles and its libertarian suspicion of the state have conclusively demonstrated that its utilitarian philosophical principles are untenable as a foundation of freedom. This means that some authors are included whose fundamental attitudes are philosophically so materialist as to be today radically out of accord with the demands of freedom.

There is, in these circumstances, no Alexandrian corpus upon which all lovers of freedom could agree. The objective value of *The Free Man's Library* derives, paradoxically, from the fact that it reflects the subjective stage at which one capable and devoted man has arrived in his effort

to unravel these problems. Understood in these terms, the rationale of the inclusion at one and the same time of Paine and Burke, of Bentham and Kuehnelt-Leddihn and Kirk, of a whole group of socialist anti-Communists and of Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich Hayek, becomes clear. In its reflection of that rationale lies the value of this book.

FRANK S. MEYER

## Also Its Excuses

**The Heart Has Its Reasons: The Memoirs of the Duchess of Windsor.** 372 pp. New York: David McKay Company. \$5.00

Though she never became the consort of a reigning king of England, Wallis Windsor has not lived without fealty. One of the largest countries in the world, Suburbia, has looked up to her example for twenty years, and it is for the ladies of this prosperous realm that she has now fashioned the heroine of her memoirs. A whole sheaf of illustrations show her town and country houses in France, their garden furniture, butlers' pantries, floral arrangements, etc.; and the pictures of the Duchess herself present a lady who might only be the smartly tailored belle of a Michigan country club, and not the international hedonist who arrives and departs so punctually in the newsreels.

In the same spirit of *noblesse oblige*, she has simplified her character. Though she quotes her astute Aunt Bessie Merryman as insisting “that I have always had a plan germinating at the back of my mind for everything

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER  
Box 101, Murray Hill Station  
New York 16, N. Y.

Return mail service—postpaid  
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

.....\$.....payment enclosed  
Please send me: .....  
(name of book)  
.....  
Name .....  
Address .....

(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

I have done," Wallis herself says No. Instead, she sees a girl of impulse and whim, rash, fun-loving, gay, into whose life calculation and long-term decisions have had very little entrée. Like Helen of Troy, or Cleopatra, she has simply been caught up in circumstances and consequences she was barely aware of.

But these memoirs belie her. Even the tactful minimum she discloses of her first marriage to a handsome aviator who turned out to be too alcoholic, and her second marriage to a generous executive who turned out to be too sober, reveal that from the beginning Miss Warfield always knew what she wanted: not merely to keep up with the Joneses, but to incarnate the ideal with whom the whole hierarchy of Joneses try to keep up. Whatever its reasons, her heart has always been very, very reasonable, and her life has never been less efficiently arranged than her coiffure. Far from being at the mercy of history, she has been one of its most purposeful engineers. Her lengthy account of the abdication crisis sidesteps the pivotal fact: if she had not coolly proceeded with her divorce from Ernest Simpson, the whole question of her marriage to a weak, undedicated king could never have come up. The crucial decision was her own, and she acted very unimpulsively for her own purposes.

Pleasure-loving, shrewdly self-disciplined (when she sees that she can not do something, like playing golf, or the piano, very well, she eschews it entirely), very material, she is also a little naive. Everything about her housekeeping, interior decoration, and personal appearance suggests that fiercely excessive attention to detail which always betrays the *parvenu*. Though she never seems to have thought of it, one reason why the bluebloods of Britain dealt with her so coldly was simply the fact that she worked too hard. True aristocrats are never *plus royaliste que le roi*. Their hair is often mussed, and it would never occur to their presumption to say, "Hoping to enrich my mind, I even tackled Will Durant's *Story of Philosophy*."

The blurb is right, though. Her life, alas, was doubtless go down as "the great love story of our time."

ROBERT PHELPS

## REVIEWED IN BRIEF

**Shakespeare and the Natural Condition**, by Geoffrey Bush. 135 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. \$3.00

In the army of the younger Fortinbras," says Mr. Bush, "twenty thousand men go to their graves like beds for 'a fantasy and trick of fame.' This is action, and it stings Hamlet's conscience; yet the twenty thousand men fight for a plot not wide enough to hide the slain, 'for an eggshell.' There is no great argument for action; to act is greatly to find quarrel in a straw." If in this specimen you discern profound critical acumen embellished by delightful conceits, hasten rejoicing to the nearest bookstore. But if the quotation suggests to you an exhibition by a linguistic contortionist, you had best confine your reading to less mannered writers—for instance, Shakespeare.

**The Life of Man with God**, by Thomas Verner Moore. 402 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$3.95

The author, who was for many years a priest, physician and psychiatrist, and recently entered the Carthusian Order, might well have given to this book the title, unfortunately pre-empted by William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*. Answers obtained on questionnaires submitted to both laymen and ecclesiastics are supplemented by copious quotations from St. Theresa and St. Juan de la Cruz, and interpreted in the light of the author's personal experience and observations.

**The Art of Real Happiness**, by Norman Vincent Peale and Smiley Blanton, M.D. 280 pp. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. \$3.50

This soothing emulsion of clinical psychology and evangelical Christianity (second edition) is not likely to please the man who prefers either ingredient in its pure state, but persons who respond emotionally to superficial cheerfulness will find it an efficacious emollient for their bruised spirits.

**From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States**, by Robert H. Bremner. 364 pp. New York: New York University Press. \$5.50

The thesis of this book is succinctly stated in a marvellous specimen of sociological double-talk: "the assumption by the state of responsibility for activities formerly performed by individuals . . . is a rejection of the paternalistic authority previously exercised by private individuals; it is a substitution of democratic for dictatorial [sic] control over the material conditions of [men's] lives."

**Union House, Union Bar (The History of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL-CIO)**, by Matthew Josephson. 369 pp. New York: Random House. \$5.00

Mr. Josephson, who may be remembered for his irate diatribe on the *Robber Barons* of finance, here recounts with benign satisfaction the growth of a monopoly which was able to break up employers' federations, consolidated its control by using "the arbitration machinery set up for wartime emergencies," and now enjoys an illusory prosperity by always charging more and more for less and less.

**Automation: Friend or Foe?** by R. H. Macmillan. 100 pp. New York: Cambridge University Press. \$1.95

This is a concise, sober and eminently readable discussion of the ever increasing use in modern industry of automatically controlled machinery and digital computers. Since the first of these was introduced in 1801, and the second invented in 1829, the industrial changes now taking place are merely a logical continuation of the Industrial Revolution and will produce no sudden transformation of social or economic life. The author has avoided both the verbosity and the meretricious tricks of presentation that are so frequently thought to be indispensable in a "popular" book.

(Reviewed by Revilo Oliver)



# To the Editor

## From a Princeton Undergraduate

As a college student, I have found *NATIONAL REVIEW* invaluable in that it has time and again bolstered my faith in the conservative cause. Your editorials are forthright and effective; your articles, laden with significant information seldom receiving adequate coverage in the liberal press. It is indeed a comfort to know that all political journals are no longer safely within the fold of the liberal, conformist UN worshippers. I do suggest, however, that *NATIONAL REVIEW*, by publishing occasional articles by prominent liberals, would both increase its circulation and give its readers the splendid opportunity of drawing comparisons between the creed of conservatives and the Gospel of the Learned Ones. . . .

Princeton, N.J.

KENT C. SMITH

## Name Names

Rodney Gilbert's article "The Red Opium Conspiracy" (September 15) is a magnificent exposure of the devilish world-wide conspiracy of the Chinese Reds to flood the free nations with narcotics . . . and of the little clique of liars and traitors among American journalists and State Department foreign service people who were, in the 1940's, boosting Mao Tse-tung as an agrarian reformer and great man and attacking Chiang Kai-shek as corrupt and decadent . . .

But Gilbert then says: "Names could be named. But what good would that do?" . . . The American people should know . . . who poisoned the wells of public opinion in the 1940's, and so corrupted the minds of our leaders in Washington as to contribute to the fall of China to the Reds—one of the worst disasters in American history . . .

VINCENT GODFREY BURNS

Annapolis, Md.

## Honoring "Mr. Republican"

I read with much interest the letter "The Taft Memorial" written by Miss Elizabeth Manning [September 8]. I cannot emphasize too strongly my complete and absolute agreement

with her when she writes that "the greatest memorial to Senator Taft would be rebirth of his wing of the Republican Party." The real beginning of such rebirth can happen on this coming election day in the event that Eisenhower goes down to defeat. I shall play my part in making this possible by not voting for him, but shall vote for E. Ross Adair for U.S. Representative and Homer Capehart for the U.S. Senate, who are Taft Republicans in my ledger. . . .

Fort Wayne, Ind.

JULIUS C. LUSARDI

## South Carolina Petitions

At the conclusion of the article by Mr. Jones in your issue of September 8, it is said, "although some fifty delegates bolted the convention to organize a campaign, they finished the almost impossible task of getting 10,000 signatures on their petition . . ."

Actually, there was no bolt. But a great many delegates supported a resolution to permit South Carolina Democrats to vote for independent electors. The resolution failed to carry. Four days after the convention, a movement was launched to get the necessary petition signed in spite of the fact that the long Labor Day weekend began at the same time. Approximately 9,000 signatures were obtained in Charleston County alone. Three days after Labor Day, petitions bearing some 37,000 signatures were filed with the Secretary of State and the independent electors will appear on the ballot.

R. M. HITT, JR.

Editor, *Charleston Evening Post*  
Charleston, S.C.

## The Supreme Court

Henry Hazlitt, in his lucid piece on the unrestricted power of the Supreme Court to "interpret" amendments to the Constitution [September 1] lists a number of possible correctives in the form of proposals for constitutional amendments.

I should like to submit another such proposal: Whenever the Supreme Court, by any decision reversing the prior decisions of that body, brings about a changed interpreta-

tion of the Constitution, it shall be mandatory for the resulting change to be acted upon by the Congress and by the several states in the form of a constitutional amendment, in the manner prescribed for such amendment; and no such decision of the Supreme Court shall be of any force or effect unless and until it shall have been approved as an amendment to the Constitution.

Nothing contained in any of the amendments proposed by Mr. Hazlitt is designed to accomplish the fundamentally necessary purpose of restoring the sole power to amend the Constitution to the people. It is the usurpation of this amending power by the Supreme Court . . . which is the root cause of the evil; and therefore what we need is an amendment which would unequivocally restrict the Court—as I think my proposed amendment would—just as the proposed Bricker Amendment would restrict the treaty-making power of the Executive branch.

Redondo Beach, Cal.

JOHN C. ROBB

## "Civilized"

. . . I enjoy the *REVIEW* very much. It is informing, refreshing and civilized.

MRS. ERNEST CARROLL MOORE

La Crescenta, Cal.

## NATIONAL TRENDS

(Continued from p. 8)

over Suez. The Eisenhower State Department does not want it, and it evidently possesses the resources to keep those in line who do. Not the least of these resources, ironically, is the prestige of the "world's leader for peace," which B&F have so assiduously nurtured.

Specifically, where it all will probably end up is in a Western boycott of Suez, which will be sustained just long enough to permit Soviet pilots and technicians to get the Canal into operation. One other possibility looms: Mr. Dulles may suggest that, as a "compromise," the users' association agree to pay tolls to Nasser in exchange for recognition of the association's "right" to employ its own pilots. Nasser would probably buy such a plan since it would acknowledge Egypt's sovereignty over the Canal, and would leave Western commerce at his and his friends' mercy.

# THE IVORY TOWER

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

## *Whoso Would Their Lustre Lessen . . .*

Bowing to the academic calendar, The Ivory Tower suspended publication during the summer. Even so, readers were thoughtful enough to keep on sending in random material on Life in the College World, Spring Term, 1956, much of which is worth reproducing:

—The editors of the *Connecticut Daily Campus*, of the University of Connecticut, are at a total loss to understand the action of the regents of Washington University banning subversive speakers from the campus. How on earth can they tell if someone is subversive, for heaven's sake? "How does one recognize a subversive? Is a subversive a person who has been a critic of the administration of the government? Is a subversive anyone who McCarthy has intimated is a Communist or a fellow-traveler? . . . The decision of Washington University intimates a great lack of confidence in the mental powers of the Washington University students." And who would want to intimate a lack of confidence in the mental powers of Washington University students? Certainly not anyone with mental power; certainly not the editors of the *Connecticut Daily Campus*.

—The editors of *Ken*—indisputably "The Oldest Active Newspaper on the Brooklyn College Campus"—ended the school year with mixed feelings of joy and wrath. The joy was over the Supreme Court's decision on Brooklyn Professor Harry Slochower, which ruled illegal his dismissal by Brooklyn College for having pleaded the Fifth Amendment before a congressional committee. The Supreme Court's decision was, the editors declared, "a victory for democracy and justice over the mass hysteria generated by the likes of the very junior senator from Wisconsin and the very hapless senator from Mississippi. . . the Supreme Court has rescued Slochower from

this modern-intellectual version of the Inquisition."

The sorrow stemmed from the pinched vindictiveness of their president, Mr. Harry Gideonse. For Mr. Gideonse had proceeded to fire Mr. Slochower on other grounds ("conduct," i.e., blatant pro-Communism and pleading of the Fifth Amendment, "unbecoming to a teacher"). "Gideonse" circumvention of the Supreme Court decision bears striking similarity to the efforts of Southern racists to bypass legally the recent court ruling on segregation . . . Gideonse, as a man of intellect, has no excuse; for his action is entirely incongruous with all intellectual principle . . . Gideonse has violated the spirit of the Court's decision—which we think is in extreme poor taste and will not add one iota to the lustre of Brooklyn College as a center of liberalism in education." And let him who fails to add lustre to a college as a center of Liberalism in education go forward with heavy gait, and bent head.

—At Yale, the John Dewey Society invited the Communist historian, Herbert Aptheker, to lecture on the question, "Will the Underdeveloped Areas Choose Democracy?" The editors of the *Yale Daily News* were a little uneasy about the fact that there had arisen no opposition, from any quarter, to the action of the officers of the John Dewey Society; but then, on reconsideration, weren't so surprised after all, given the fact that "no reasonable person would question either their right or their wisdom in issuing the invitation." At Yale there are only men of reason and wisdom, which is surely why the invitation to Mr. Aptheker was not questioned by anybody.

—A student at UCLA in Los Angeles sends us a term paper he did on the Status of Forces Treaty, in which he ardently opposes it. The paper comes with the handwritten comments and marginalia of his pro-

fessor in the Constitutional History of the United States, one Dr. Hyman. Dr. Hyman gave his student, Mr. Robert W. Van de Walle, "a low grade because your major sources are untrustworthy, your logic is deficient, and you failed to offer both sides of the constitutional as apart from the political issue involved. Much of it is sheer nonsense."

Commenting on Van de Walle's objection to the authority of foreign judicial and penal systems over American soldiers, Dr. Hyman scrawled, "Are NATO nations' laws less protective of civil rights than the US? Certainly not most of them." Elsewhere Dr. Hyman refers to "the whole Bricker Amendment silliness." After urging the unconstitutionality of the Status of Forces Treaty, Van de Walle concluded: "Why should some friendless and poorly paid G.I. who is overseas and away from his home and family . . . be forsaken?"—on which Dr. Hyman commented, "Please, such asinities do your own convictions no justice. It is rank sophomorphism. The tears flow but the brain is untouched." Dr. Hyman was evidently being sarcastic. His tears most surely did not flow. Tear-flowing is for sophomores.

—The editors of the *Cornell Daily Sun* look back on Princeton's invitation to Hiss and speculate about great events. They remind their readers that "Alger Hiss was never proven to be a Communist." He was merely "sentenced to jail for perjury—and perjury alone." To be sure, "many have tried to make this imply that he lied because he didn't want to confess that he was a Communist traitor"—if you can imagine anyone reasoning so grossly—"but there is no indication whatsoever that he was at any time a conspirator." In point of fact, "Even the perjury sentence is shaky. The evidence that Whittaker Chambers drew out of a pumpkin like a magician from a hat, has been called by reputable legal men as limited and misleading. Certainly there is room for dispute in the issue." And what better place for such discussion than in centers of Liberalism in Education?

Those interested in broadening that discussion a little, to include even those who think Hiss was guilty, are invited to consult the opposite page.



# Over 1,000 Students

## Last Year Requested NATIONAL REVIEW From the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists

The ISI is four years old. It is an organization dedicated to furnishing students with educational material on the principles of the free economy, limited government, and anti-Communism.

The organization, of which Mr. Frank Chodorov is president, collects no dues, imposes no obligations—except that once a year members must specifically request to remain on its rolls. Otherwise, their membership in ISI lapses.

Many students in America are hard up. They cannot afford to pay the full subscription price for NATIONAL REVIEW; and NATIONAL REVIEW cannot afford to send them the magazine free. But NATIONAL REVIEW will give subscriptions to the ISI at the mere manufacturing cost (paper, printing and fulfillment) of five dollars—provided the student who wants the magazine puts up a dollar of his own money.

Will you help finance subscriptions for college students who request NATIONAL REVIEW? Specifically: Will you make up the difference for a student who shows enough interest to send in one dollar for a subscription?

For every four dollars you donate to the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists (donations to the ISI are tax-exempt)—NATIONAL REVIEW will send a one-year subscription to a student who has asked for the magazine.

---

NATIONAL REVIEW  
211 East 37th St.  
New York 16, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... Please send ..... subscriptions (at four dollars each) to students who have asked for the magazine.

Name .....

Address .....

City .....Zone .....State .....

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIETY OF INDIVIDUALISTS